

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 11, 2004. Claims 1-64 remain pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicants have cancelled claims 1-11 without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Satta et al* (6,391,785). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Satta et al. discloses a method for selectively depositing a barrier layer over an insulating surface to expose an underlying conductive material at a via bottom. (See *Satta et al.* at col. 4, lines 5-59.) *Satta et al.* further discloses filling the via with copper and an optional copper seed layer over the barrier layer. (See *Satta et al.* at col. 13, lines 38-65.) In other words, the teachings of *Satta et al.* are very specific to forming multi-level interconnect structures within an insulating, dielectric material.

Satta et al. does not teach, show, or suggest depositing a tungsten nitride layer followed by a tungsten layer, as recited in base claims 12, 31, 44, and 58, and those dependent therefrom. *Satta et al.* also does not teach, show, or suggest heating a wafer having a polysilicon layer disposed thereon to a temperature of about 550°C or more and forming a chlorine terminated surface by exposing a polysilicon layer to a chlorine-containing compound, as recited in base claims 44 and 58, and those dependent therefrom. Further, *Satta et al.* does not teach, show, or suggest heating a wafer having a polysilicon layer disposed thereon to a temperature of about 550°C or more; forming a chlorine terminated surface by exposing a polysilicon layer to a chlorine-containing compound; and reducing the chlorine terminated surface by exposing the polysilicon layer to a nitrogen-containing compound, as recited in base claim 58 and those dependent therefrom. Accordingly, *Satta et al.* does not motivate or suggest the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Office Action.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Robb D. Edmonds
Robb D. Edmonds
Registration No. 46,681
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

257712_3

Page 11